

HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

MARK DAVISCOURT,

Plaintiff,

v.

GWANNETTE M. CLAYBROOK.,
et. al,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C18-1148 RAJ

ORDER

This matter comes before the court on *pro se* Plaintiff Mark Davigourt's ("Plaintiff") "Motion to File an Over-Length Motion in Support of Pending Motion to Vacate the Judgment Under FRCP Rule 60(d)(3)," Dkt. # 45, and "Motion to File an Overlength Motion in Support of Pending Motion to Extend Time to Serve Talled Defendants." Dkt. # 47.

On August 21, 2019, this Court granted Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint, but permitted Plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint. Dkt. # 39. In its Order, this Court noted that Plaintiff's initial complaint spanned over 120 pages and included "indecipherable accusations of a nefarious conspiracy" and irrelevant legal citations. Dkt. # 38 at 2. However, the Court provided Plaintiff with an opportunity to file an amended complaint no longer than 25 pages in length. *Id.* at 11. Plaintiff appealed to the Ninth Circuit, which affirmed this Court's order. Dkt. # 43.

1 Plaintiff now seeks leave to file two over-length briefs. Plaintiff indicates that his
2 Motion to Extend Time to Serve Tolled Defendants is currently 23 pages long (not
3 including exhibits), Dkt. #47 at 2, and his Motion to Vacate is currently 24 pages long
4 (not including exhibits). Dkt. # 45 at 2. Plaintiff contends that the issues in this case are
5 complex and require extensive citation to the record. Dkt. # 47 at 2. Specifically, Plaintiff
6 indicates that “intentional misrepresentations made by the Justice Department” and
7 “senior officers and officials employed by the Treasury Department,” the IRS, and
8 unknown Assistant United States Attorneys must be brought before the Court and justify
9 the filing of over-length briefs. Dkt. # 45 at 3; Dkt. # 47 at 3.

10 Under Local Civil Rule 7(f), motions to file an over-length brief are “disfavored.”
11 While Plaintiff asserts that 12 pages per motion is insufficient to address the arguments
12 he intends to raise, he has not shown good cause to deviate from the pleading standards
13 set forth in the Local Rules. The Court therefore **DENIES** Plaintiff’s Motions. Dkt. ##
14 45, 47.

15 Dated this 22nd day of November, 2022.

17 
18

19 The Honorable Richard A. Jones
20 United States District Judge
21
22
23
24
25
26
27